



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

SO A APPLICATION NO. FILING DATE FIRST NAMED INVENTOR ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.

09/105,528 06/26/98 KNOWLES

N CR9-98-062

LM02/0925

EXAMINER

GREGORY M DOUDNIKOFF
IBM CORPORATION T81/062
PO BOX 12195
RESEARCH TRIANGLE PARK NC 27709

LE, U

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2771

DATE MAILED:

09/25/00

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/105,528	Applicant(s) Knowles
	Examiner Uyen Le	Group Art Unit 2771

Responsive to communication(s) filed on Jul 26, 1900

This action is **FINAL**.

Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 month(s), or thirty days, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Disposition of Claims

Claim(s) 1, 3-8, 10-15, and 17-20 is/are pending in the application.

Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

Claim(s) 1, 3-8, 10-15, and 17-20 is/are rejected.

Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

Claims _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

Application Papers

See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.

The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.

The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is approved disapproved.

The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

All Some* None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been

received.

received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) _____.

received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*Certified copies not received: _____

Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

Notice of References Cited, PTO-892

Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). _____

Interview Summary, PTO-413

Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948

Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

— SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES —

DETAILED ACTION

Answers to Arguments

1. Applicant's cancellation of claim 16 is acknowledged. Consequently, objection to claim 16 is withdrawn.
2. Applicant's arguments regarding claims 1, 8 and 15 have been fully considered but they are moot in view of the new grounds of rejection presented in this Office Action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1, 3-8, 10-15, 17-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over applicant's admitted prior art (AAPA) at pages 3-5, 25, in view of Brown et al (US 5,875,445).

Claim 1 merely recites well known components in any computing environment for a code to allow a visually-oriented technique for navigating an object model. Applicant admitted that the prior art has code for displaying a browser, retrieving elements of said browser, selecting one of said elements and retrieving and displaying relationship information from said model (see page 3, line 4-page 5, line 9, Figure 3C). Although AAPA does not specifically show that the user can select one or more relationships from the relationship information, it is well known in the art as shown by Brown to allow the user to select a relationship from the relationship information (see column 13, lines 29-

39). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include a subprocess enabling users to select one or more relationships from the relationship information while implementing the code for navigating an object model in AAPA in order to give users more flexibility in browsing a model.

Regarding claims 3, 5, applicant admitted that techniques for performing action choices are well known in the art (see page 25, line 4). Since the browser is an interactive tool for developing an object model, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include a sub process for presenting an action list in order to allow the user to navigate through possible actions with each element.

Regarding claim 4, since each updated pane presents a different relationship information according to user's selection, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include in the action list actions tailored to said selected one or more relationships.

Regarding claim 6, official notice is taken that it is well known in the art to filter an action list to limit the choices appropriate to each model. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include filtering the action list while implementing the code in order to limit the actions appropriate to each model.

Regarding claim 7, the prior art clearly used a conventional browser (see Figure 3C).

Claims 8, 10-14 correspond respectively to a system for the computer program product of claims 1, 3-7, therefore are rejected for the same reasons stated in claims 1, 3-7 above.

Claims 15, 17-20 correspond respectively to a method for the computer program product of claims 1, 3-7, therefore are rejected for the same reasons stated in claims 1, 3-7 above.

Conclusion

4. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Uyen Le whose telephone number is (703) 305-4134. The examiner can be reached on Monday through Thursday from 7:00am to 5:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Thomas Black can be reached on (703)305-9707.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington DC 20231

or faxed to: (703)308-9051, (for formal communications intended for entry)

or: (703)308-5403, (for informal or draft communications, please label PROPOSED or DRAFT)

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA., Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone is (703)305-3900.

UL

09/19/00

Thomas G. Black
THOMAS G. BLACK
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
OCT 27 2000